<u>Remarks</u>

In view of the following discussion, the applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 102, or obvious under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 103. Thus, the applicants believe that all of these claims are in allowable form.

OBJECTIONS

A. Title

The Examiner objects to the title of the invention. In particular, the Examiner indicates that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicants have amended the Title to provide a more descriptive title to which the claims are directed.

In view of this amendment to the Title of the invention, the basis for the Examiner's objection has been removed. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

B. Claims

The Examiner objects to claims 9-10 because of informalities. In particular, the Examiner indicates that the phrase "the a defined playing time" should be amended to recite "the defined playing time". Applicants point out that such amendments to claims 9-10 were made at page 2 of the Preliminary Amendment filed on December 22, 1999.

In view of the amendments made to claims 9-10 in the Preliminary

Amendment filed on December 22, 1999, the basis for the Examiner's objection thereto has been removed. As such, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS

A. 35 U. S. C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 4-10 are not anticipated by Kawamura et al.

Claims 1-2 and 4-10 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawamura et al. (U. S. Patent 6,075,920 issued June 13, 2000). The applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated by this reference.

Claim 1 is directed to a replay appliance for accessing information stored on a recording media (see, specification at page 2, lines 8-12). The replay appliance includes a scanning device, a search means and a comparator (see, specification at page 2, line 24 to page 3, line 10). The scanning device first scans the recording media (see, specification at page 4, lines 21-25). The search means then performs a binary search of the scanned recording medium based on a replay time (see, specification at page 4, lines 7-21). The comparator compares the replay time to a desired replay time and the scanning device scans information on the recording media at a point that corresponds to the result of the comparator to access information stored on the recording media at the defined playing time (see, specification at page 4, line 21 to page 6, line 2).

Kawamura et al. describes an apparatus for recording and reproducing video data (see, Kawamura et al. at column 1, lines 7-11). In Kawamura et al., time code information is recorded at the head of each sector of the recording medium (see, Kawamura et al. at column 5, lines 49-67). A search is made based on a time code specified by a user (see, Kawamura et al. at column 14, lines 54-56). A control unit instructs a pickup to move to the sector of the recording medium where the time code specified by the user is located (see, Kawamura et al. at column 14, line 59 to column 15, line 15).

Kawamura et al. does not describe or suggest a replay appliance in which a scanning device first scans a recording media, then a search means performs

a binary search of the scanned recording medium based on a replay time, a comparator compares the replay time to a desired replay time and the scanning device scans information on the recording media at a point that corresponds to the result of the comparator to access information stored on the recording media at the desired playing time. Rather, Kawamura et al. only teaches searching time code information recorded in each sector of a recording medium based on a time code specified by a user and moving a pickup to the sector of the recording medium where the time code specified by the user is located. Since Kawamura et al. does not teach use of a replay appliance in which a scanning device first scans a recording media, then a search means performs a binary search of the scanned recording medium based on a replay time, a comparator compares the replay time to a desired replay time and the scanning device scans information on the recording media at a point that corresponds to the result of the comparator to access information stored on the recording media at the desired playing time, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 4-10 are patentable over Kawamura et al.

- B. 35 U. S. C. §103
- Claims 3 and 11-12 are not obvious over Kawamura et al. in view of Carter et al.

Claims 3 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kawamura et al. (U. S. Patent 6,075,920 issued June 13, 2000) in view of Carter et al. (U. S. Patent 5,845,331 issued December 1, 1998). The applicants submit that these claims are not rendered obvious by the combination of these references.

Claims 3 and 11-12 depend directly, or indirectly, from claim 1 which is directed to a replay appliance for accessing information stored on a recording media (see, specification at page 2, lines 8-12). The replay appliance includes a scanning device, a search means and a comparator (see, specification at page 2,

line 24 to page 3, line 10). The scanning device first scans the recording media (see, specification at page 4, lines 21-25). The search means then performs a binary search of the scanned recording medium based on a replay time (see, specification at page 4, lines 7-21). The comparator compares the replay time to a desired replay time and the scanning device scans information on the recording media at a point that corresponds to the result of the comparator to access information stored on the recording media at the defined playing time (see, specification at page 4, line 21 to page 6, line 2).

Kawamura et al. describes an apparatus for recording and reproducing video data (see, Kawamura et al. at column 1, lines 7-11). In Kawamura et al., time code information is recorded at the head of each sector of the recording medium (see, Kawamura et al. at column 5, lines 49-67). A search is made based on a time code specified by a user (see, Kawamura et al. at column 14, lines 54-56). A control unit instructs a pickup to move to the sector of the recording medium where the time code specified by the user is located (see, Kawamura et al. at column 14, line 59 to column 15, line 15).

Kawamura et al. does not describe or suggest a replay appliance in which a scanning device first scans a recording media, then a search means performs a binary search of the scanned recording medium based on a replay time, a comparator compares the replay time to a desired replay time and the scanning device scans information on the recording media at a point that corresponds to the result of the comparator to access information stored on the recording media at the desired playing time. Rather, Kawamura et al. only teaches searching time code information recorded in each sector of a recording medium based on a time code specified by a user and moving a pickup to the sector of the recording medium where the time code specified by the user is located. Since Kawamura et al. does not teach use of a replay appliance in which a scanning device first scans a recording media, then a search means performs a binary search of the replay time to a desired replay time and the scanning device scans information

on the recording media at a point that corresponds to the result of the comparator to access information stored on the recording media at the desired playing time, claims 3 and 11-12 are patentable over Kawamura et al.

Carter et al. describes a memory system (see, Carter et al. at column 1, lines 61-63). The memory system includes shared memory for storing instructions and data (see, Carter et al. at column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 1). Access to the shared memory of the memory system is restricted by guarded pointers (see, Carter et al. at column 2, lines 2-17).

Carter et al. does not describe or suggest a replay appliance in which a scanning device first scans a recording media, then a search means performs a binary search of the scanned recording medium based on a replay time, a comparator compares the replay time to a desired replay time and the scanning device scans information on the recording media at a point that corresponds to the result of the comparator to access information stored on the recording media at the desired playing time. Rather, Carter et al. teaches a completely different arrangement in which access to a shared memory of a memory system is restricted by guarded pointers. Since Carter et al. does not teach use of a replay appliance in which a scanning device first scans a recording media, then a search means performs a binary search of the scanned recording medium based on a replay time, a comparator compares the replay time to a desired replay time and the scanning device scans information on the recording media at a point that corresponds to the result of the comparator to access information stored on the recording media at the desired playing time, claims 3 and 11-12 are patentable over Carter et al.

Furthermore, since Kawamura et al. only teaches searching time code information recorded in each sector of a recording medium based on a time code specified by a user and moving a pickup to the sector of the recording medium where the time code specified by the user is located and Carter et al. only teaches an arrangement in which access to a shared memory of a memory system is restricted by guarded pointers, the combination of these references

does not describe or suggest applicant's arrangement recited in claims 3 and 11-12. In particular, claims 3 and 11-12 recite a replay appliance in which a scanning device first scans a recording media, then a search means performs a binary search of the scanned recording medium based on a replay time, a comparator compares the replay time to a desired replay time and the scanning device scans information on the recording media at a point that corresponds to the result of the comparator to access information stored on the recording media at the desired playing time. Thus, claims 3 and 11-12 are patentable over the combination of these references.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 102, or obvious under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 103. Consequently, the applicants believe that all of the claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Ms. Patricia A. Verlangieri, at (609)

Serial No.: 09/469,865

RCA 89,912

734-6867, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Verlangieri, Attorney

Reg. No. 42,201 (609) 734-6867

Patent Operations Thomson Inc. P. O. Box 5312 Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

February 5, 2004